

The Brilliance of Our Teachers

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2005-07/msg00012.html>

- *From:* "Esaelp" <esaelp@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Jul 2005 10:41:33 -0400
-

The Brilliance of Our Teachers

"Great spirits have always encountered violent oppositions from mediocre minds." – A. Einstein

A recent newspaper question and answer column raised an interesting subject. The query noted that, for a science course at a local school, there were two instructors. One of those instructors explained the concepts clearly and his students did well on standardized tests. The other instructor's teachings were scattered and his students performed poorly. The students, however, believed that the second instructor was brilliant and thought that his explanations are simply over their heads. The query went on to ask why such a misperception occurred.

The answer given was that both groups were easily misled into believing that mysterious people are highly intelligent. When those listeners heard material they didn't grasp, they assumed that the fault was theirs and not the teachers. And, since the listeners considered themselves fairly intelligent, it was obvious that the teacher must be brilliant!

Judging from the material posted in these Newsgroups, the effect would seem to be quite pronounced. It is quite plain that the posters ardently believe in the validity of what they have been taught. It is also quite obvious that they are aware, if only sublimely, of the inconsistencies and contradictions within that teaching. If that were not the case, the subject matter would be straightforward by now, the understanding of modern physics would not be so muddled, and the postings would not suggest such a high level of misunderstanding.

The truth of the matter is that the subjects, relativity in particular, seem mysterious and contradictory for one basic reason. The teachers of the subject do not themselves understand it. Because they don't understand the subject they hide behind sophisticated, often unnecessary and sometimes self contradictory mathematical explanations to prevent that lack of understanding from being apparent. In order to achieve this goal they have made Physics into the only Science where MECHANISM is not considered. This is illustrated by a quotation from Dr. Hawking who exclaimed, in an interview, that he was only interested in mathematics and observation and in the correlation of the two approaches. He didn't care about "reality" (for

The Brilliance of Our Teachers

which we may read mechanism) because he didn't know what reality was. This is unfortunate because the present practice of ignoring mechanism, and overlooking the fact that nothing is known until observation, mathematics and understanding of mechanism are in agreement. Without such an agreement an understanding of the process(es) involved is not assured. It is only when all three requirements have been met that we can have any hope of knowing "who is doing what to whom".

Even more important, without including mechanism in our understanding matrix, we eliminate a vital check on validity. The mathematics of many processes extends to regions which are physically unrealizable. Without considering mechanism these "empty" regions will not be recognized. An example of the effect is the idea that "virtual photons" can explain forces which act at a distance. "Virtual photons" can easily explain repulsive forces acting between material particles, but they can not be used to explain attractive forces. The same is true of "gravitons". They cannot produce the attractive force of gravity! "Virtual particles" can only produce repulsive forces. An understanding "mechanism" reveals this deficiency quite clearly.

To put the relativity concepts into perspective, the current orthodoxy accepts the validity of the idea that there are no absolutes. Length is what yardsticks measure and time is what clocks measure. What is conveniently overlooked is that the forces existing between the atoms in a yardstick and the hairspring of a clock escapement (or their conceptual equivalents in actual test equipment) must be electromagnetic in nature. Not only is electromagnetism the only known candidate for these forces, the need for them follows if the questionable idea of modern physics that interatomic forces are produced by the exchange of "virtual photons" is not to collapse instantaneously. In addition, the speed of a clock is affected by the mass of its balance wheel (or equivalent) as given by $M=E/C^2$ and the stiffness of the forces between the nuclei of the "hairspring" (or equivalent). Since all of the preceding are functions of the velocity of light in the local reference frame, it is rather foolish to make the assertion that length is what yardsticks measure and time is what clocks measure without taking into account the effect that possible changes in the actual velocity of light might have on them. Such changes may be concealed by relativistically induced changes in the atomic spacings, stiffnesses and inertial masses of our instruments. When one does take these considerations into account, the Principle of Relativity and the invariance of the local velocity of light follow at once for the simple reason that matter must be using the local "en vacuo" velocity of light to control its parameters. A physicist who does not recognize this instinctively is clearly in the wrong line of work. (I understand Wal-Mart is hiring.). One does not need to resort to the sophisticated and to a large degree defective teachings of an arrogant intellectual elite. Once the basics are recognized, the understanding of the process involved do not require advanced mathematics, they are within the capabilities of a bright high school physics student.

The source material for this posting may be found in "Gravity" (1987),

The Brilliance of Our Teachers

"The Einstein Hoax" (1997), and "Corrections to Residual Errors in Special Relativity (1999) located at <http://einsteinhoax.com/>. EVERYTHING WHICH WE ACCEPT AS TRUE MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH EVERYTHING ELSE WE HAVE ACCEPTED AS TRUE, IT MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OBSERVATIONS, AND IT MUST BE MATHEMATICALLY VIABLE. PRESENT TEACHINGS DO NOT ALWAYS MEET THIS REQUIREMENT. THE WORLD IS ENTITLED TO A HIGHER STANDARD OF WORKMANSHIP FROM THOSE IT HAS GRANTED WORLD CLASS STATUS.

All Newsposts by this Website are available at
<http://einsteinhoax.com/postinglog.htm>

Please make any response via E-mail as Newsgroups are not monitored on a regular basis. Objective responses will be treated with the same courtesy as they are presented. To prevent the wastage of time on both of our parts, please do not raise objections that are not related to material that you have read at the Website. This posting is merely a summary.

E-mail:- einsteinhoax@xxxxxxx

The material at the Website has been posted continuously for over 5 years. In that time THERE HAVE BEEN NO OBJECTIVE REBUTTALS OF ANY OF THE MATERIAL PRESENTED. There have only been hand waving arguments by individuals who have mindlessly accepted the prevailing wisdom without questioning it. If anyone provides a significant rebuttal that cannot be objectively answered, the material at the Website will be withdrawn. Challenges to date have revealed only the responder's inadequacy with one exception for which a correction was provided.

-
- Prev by Date: [*Re: spinors*](#)
 - Next by Date: [*Re: The Paradox of Zeno*](#)
 - Previous by thread: [*spinors*](#)
 - Next by thread: [*Re: The Paradox of Zeno*](#)
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ [*Date*](#)
 - ◆ [*Thread*](#)